Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: _09/940, 141_   First Named Applicant: _Cheline_

Examiner: _Hernandez_   Art Unit: _2144_   Status of Application: _Final_

Tentative Participants:

(1) _Olga Hernandez_   (2) _Georgann S. Grunebach_

(3) _Martin R. Bader_   (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: _August 2, 2005_   Proposed Time: _2:00_ (AM/PM)

_E.S.T._

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) [X] Telephonic   (2) [ ] Personal   (3) [ ] Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [ ] YES   [X] NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) _Rej._	_1-9,11-20,23_	_U.S.P.A.N._ _2002/0178361_ _Genty et al._	[√]	[√]	[ ]
(2) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(3) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(4) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

[ ] Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: _See Attached._

_____

_____

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____ .

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

_____   _____
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature   Examiner/SPE Signature

Martin R. Bader
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

_54,736_
Registration Number, if applicable

DRAFT ARGUMENTS

DATE: July 15, 2005
TO: Olga Hernandez
FROM: Martin Bader
SERIAL NO: 09/940,141
DOCKET: PD-201118;
SUBJECT: Draft Arguments for Examiner Interview

Claims 1, 11, 13 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Genty et al. (2002/0178361). Specifically, the office action cites figures 1 and 2 of Genty for teaching the limitations of the independent claims.

Regarding independent claim 1, in part, Applicant claims, "receiving a request to establish a VPN session with a server-side system from at least one client computer out of a plurality of client computers coupled to a modem within a client-side system" and "receiving a new request to establish a new VPN session with a different server-side system from a different client computer out of said plurality of client computers coupled to said modem within said client-side system." Independent claim 1 recites at least two computers coupled to the same modem within a client side system. Figures 1 and 2 of Genty et al. do not show a plurality of computers coupled to the same modem within a client side system. Nor does the written description of Genty et al. disclose a plurality of computers coupled to the same modem within a client side system.